

can "baptizing into" mean? *Eis* (into) occurs in the following citations: Matt. 4: 8; 13: 47; 17: 15; Mk. 5: 13; 9: 32; John 21: 7; Rev. 8: 8. Bloomfield, a noted Episcopalian commentator, says on Mk. 1: 9:

"The sense of *ebaptisthe*—*eis* is, was dipped or plunged into."

Meyer (Lutheran) in his note on Matt. 3: 6, says:

"The thing visibly and sensibly symbolized in John's baptism was the repentance. But the immersion of the entire body alone answered to this, because repentance should concern and purify the entire man, to which also afterward was connected by inner necessity the specific Christian conception of the symbolical immersion and emersion."

Lange (Lutheran) on same passage says:

"And were baptized, immersed, in the Jordan, confessing their sins."

But why more exegetical testimony? Whatever the meaning of the preposition *en* (in) and *eis* (into) the question remains, what is the specific act expressed by the verb "baptize?" These prepositions can only incidentally affect the "act." Should their primary and literal signification harmonize with the primary meaning of "baptize" the argument would be in favor of their primary meaning.

4. That "both," the administrator and applicant, "went down into the water." They are also represented as coming "up out of the water." Acts 8: 38, 39. And of Jesus it is said that when he was baptized, he "went up straightway out of the water." Now as to the use of the prepositions here it would be folly for a scholar to claim for them any other than the ordinary and commonly accepted meaning. The fact that the act performed *in the water* was immersion is not at all affected by any rendering of the preposition *ek* (out of) or *apo* (from or out of.) That they both really went *down into* not *near to* or *by* the water and came *up out* of the water not merely *away from* is evidenced by the fact that the prepositions *eis* (into) and *ek* (out of) in Acts 8: 38, 39, would be meaningless if *down to* and *away from* were the full meaning; for the words "*katebasan*" and "*anebasan*," compounded of the verb "*baino*" and the prepositions "*kata*" and "*ana*," are expressive of this much.

5. That "we are buried with him by (thro) baptism unto death." Rom. 6: 4. Or to use the language of St. Paul to the Colossians, (Ch. 2: 12) he declared that their reception is in Christ "having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him thro faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead."

Neither the *going into* the water nor the *coming up out of* the water is a specific part of the "act" expressed by the words "and he baptized him." And in this "act" according to St. Paul, in baptism, the applicant is "buried." These words of Paul are not accidental. They are beautifully expressive and full of meaning. Absolutely no sophistry can escape the force of these words in favor of immersion. To show that this is no prejudiced exegesis mark the following comments by the most learned and devout biblical scholars. Indeed, scholars have scarcely a difference of opinion on these two passages. (Rom. 6: 4, and Col. 2: 12.)

Dr. Barnes (Presbyterian) says:

"It is altogether probable that the apostle in this place had allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion." Notes on Romans.

Bloomfield (Episcopalian):

"There is a plain allusion to the ancient custom of baptism by immersion" Greek Test. with Eng. Notes.

Wesley (Methodist):

"We are buried with him. Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." Notes.

Chancellor Est (Roman Catholic):

"Immersion which takes place in baptism, signifies and expresses, as has been said, the burial of Christ."

Clark (Methodist):

"Alluding to the immersion practiced in the case of adults, wherein the person appeared to be buried under the water, as Christ was buried in the heart of the earth." Com. on Col. 2: 12.

Conybeare and Howson (Episcopalians):

"This passage can not be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion." Life and Epistles of St. Paul.

Lange (Lutheran):

"Buried in death; an oxymoron, according to which burial precedes and death follows, as is illustrated in the immersion into the bath of baptism." Com. on Rom.

Tholuch (Lutheran):

"For the explanation of this figurative description of the baptismal rite, it is necessary to call attention to the well-known circumstance that in the early days of the church, persons, when baptized, were first plunged below and then raised above the water." Com. on Rom.

Besides those whose comments are here given we may mention the following well-known critical scholars whose comments on these two citations from St. Paul agree with those given: Meyer, Chalmers, Macknight, Lewin, Jowett, Colenso, Wordsworth, Reuss, Schott, K von der Heydt, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Pusey, Van Oosterzee, Schaff, Olshausen, Tyndale, Luther, and a host of others.

The words "buried" and "risen," in these passages, are expressive of the definite acts, which symbolize the dying to and putting off of old relations in the world and the resurrecting unto the new-

ness of life; and when the Christian convert in his baptism is plunged beneath the baptismal waters and raised again then only is the symbolism preserved intact and the language easily interpreted.

Now if Paul refers to baptism in these passages, and the consensus of critical opinion is that he does, and if the words in which he expresses his teaching concerning baptism are descriptive in any definite or even symbolical manner of THE ACT, and exegetes say they are, then it inevitably follows that immersion, to say the least, is the only mode in baptism that satisfies the meaning of the language.

Nor should it be forgotten that Paul's language establishes a universal mode. To the Romans he says, "Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death? We were buried, etc." "*We*" here must mean "all." For whatever the words "buried therefore with him thro (or by) baptism into death" may mean, this much that all had submitted to the same burial. The "all we" in Romans and the "ye" in Colossians including the Christians addressed in these two epistles and the apostle himself show conclusively that he spoke of them as of Christians generally and universally.

And if therefore the language of Paul referred to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion, perhaps but an incidental tho by no means an accidental reference, he undoubtedly taught that which Christ and the apostles before taught. By what authority then dare we discard even the mode of baptism and substituting therefor another mode bearing no resemblance to the specific act enjoined, and that, not as claimed in harmony with, but in direct opposition to the very spirit of the Scriptures which so fully, absolutely and unequivocally describe the act commanded by our Lord in the commission?

III. THE MEANING OF "BAPTIZO."

The Greek verb from which the "*Baptizontes*" (baptizing) in Matt. 28: 19, is derived is *Baptizo*. Can we find out the literal and primitive, and therefore the true, meaning of this word? Is it possible to communicate ideas thro human language as a reliable medium? Can divine truth be inviolably communicated as received from God himself by those who received it to succeeding generations? To each of these questions we answer, Yes.

LAWS OF INTERPRETATION.

In order that language may not be used arbitrarily or words given a meaning according to the caprice of an interpreter, certain well-defined and universally accepted laws of interpretation are to be